

9  
„Kulturbund“

League of German Scholars and Artists.

---

---

Answer

of the

Kulturbund

to a

Declaration by the Professors of

Great-Britain addressed

to the

academical Circles of Germany.

---

---

Berlin NW 7

Building of the Royal Prussian Academy of Science



We have had the grievous experience that in the present struggle which is waging between nations that rightly were considered until now guardians of civilization, even men intellectually eminent, truth-loving and masters in the use of language, no longer find it possible to understand each other when they belong to hostile parties.

It is on this account that we have up to the present considered it superfluous to reply to those who signed the "Declaration by the Professors of Great Britain addressed to the academical Circles of Germany".\*) It has been reported to us however, that our silence has been taken by many as an admission that we have good reason to feel ourselves worsted in the controversy, and we would therefore earnestly present the following statements to our English colleagues even at the risk of speaking to no purpose.

#### I.

The principal defect in the relations which have hitherto existed between the countries now hostile to each other is, as it seems to us, that they have known too little of one another. From this fact alone have arisen the misunderstandings and discords that have finally resulted in the outbreak of a mortal combat. If the educated classes in England had had only approximately a correct view of the sentiments ruling in the German people before the outbreak of the war, they would have avoided adopting the catchphrase spread abroad by journalistic swashbucklers, that the writers Nietzsche, von Treitschke, von Bülow and von Bernhardi exercised a preponderating influence in Germany; a statement that here at home called forth from those who knew the facts only a smile.

The writings of General von Bernhardi had been known only to a very small circle here, before his name was brought to our notice by way of England. The great historian von

---

\*) See appendix.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2014

Treitschke, who has been dead for twenty years, is separated by a generation from the intellectual life of present-day Germany with its mode of thinking upon political questions. Von Treitschke is industriously cited in the writings of Bernhardi, and we take it that from this fact it comes that England shows such a surprising familiarity with the former's works. The poet - philosopher Nietzsche has in fact had considerable influence upon a part of the German people, though others have always regarded him as misleading, but, in any case, it can only be through a misunderstanding of single expressions of his that he can be connected with the reproach, that Germany had a desire for universal dominion; for the conflict proclaimed by him was an intellectual one. So far as the fourth of the names mentioned is concerned, we can only suppose that perhaps he is meant, who is the most conciliatory of all German statesmen.

But even if Bernhardi had an influence in Germany, this would never have produced such a disastrous effect as that called forth by the English translation of his book „Unsere Zukunft“, („Our Future“), the title of which was changed in the translation for agitative purposes into quite another: „Britain as Germany's Vassal“. This falsification helped to stir up the minds of Englishmen to indignation against Germany. Never has there been in our country a writer who has given expression so brusquely to his delight in a war between the nations as John Ruskin when he wrote: „By war nations are created, by peace they are destroyed.“ Nevertheless we refrain from making use of these words to hurl a reproach at the sentiments of the English people.

## II.

When the English scholars assert further that until now it has been only the German army which has intentionally bombarded and destroyed historical buildings and monuments of civilization, such as the library at Louvain or the cathedrals of Reims and Malines, the limitation „until now“, (bis jetzt)\*),

---

\*) Since we have not been put in possession of the English original of the „Declaration“, we are obliged to cite the German text sent us by the signers, and in a given case to retranslate this, as nearly as we can, back into English.



if it has reference to the present war, relieves us of the necessity of answering, for in this war the troops opposed to us have had as yet no opportunity of demonstrating how far their love for German works of art extends. If however the intention was to draw past times into the comparison, history gives us examples enough of the fighting forces of our adversaries committing acts of devastation, out of mere wantonness and lust of destruction, with which the severity we were compelled to exercise, through the treacherous methods adopted by our enemies, is not to be mentioned in the same breath. For only out of bitter necessity, and with a wish to spare as far as possible, have our guns been directed at objects whose destruction we, with mankind in general, lament as an irreparable loss.

### III.

Our English colleagues are certainly right when they express the opinion, that it is difficult for the individual man under his human limitations "to weigh justly the points in dispute affecting his own country", but it seems to us yet more difficult to do the adversary justice in the midst of the hurly-burly of the moment. On this account, we do not wonder that the English scholars charge the German government with keeping back the truth, as contrasted with the action of their own government in the matter. Nevertheless we take the liberty of calling their attention to the fact, that the loss of every man and every ship is communicated to us without hesitancy by our authorities, while, from the very beginning of the war down to the present day, the English press has been charging their army administration with suppressing the news.

We shall never shirk the duty of most accurately testing the facts, but we seek the truth far back of the published diplomatic documents, and it has been established as a truth, that a peace-loving people, with a peace-loving ruler at their head, have for years been driven towards a war, which, although it remained latent until recently, had its virtual beginning with the "encircling" policy of the English King Edward VII. It was only the instinctive shrinking back from such a horrible event which preserved for the world, for a time at





least, the appearance of peace. When the matter is regarded from this point of view, the question whether the documents published by the different governments are more or less complete seems to us one of minor importance. However, the contents of the Austro-Hungarian Red Book, which has lately been issued, supplies the greater part of the gaps which our English colleagues felt obliged to point out as existing in the German compilation. The historians among them, and not only they, are sufficiently aware that a scientific presentation of the events immediately preceding the outbreak of the war, and one that is free from objection, will not be possible for a long time to come. Until this period arrives, they, as well as we, must take care to avoid pronouncing a definitive judgment.

#### IV.

It can no longer be disputed, that the murder of the successor to the Austro-Hungarian throne and his wife was carried out with the help of Servian officials, and just as little can it be doubted, that Austria had the right to demand retribution for this crime, and at the same time to secure herself against like attempts to overthrow the Monarchy. And this is so, no matter how various the opinions may be as to the way in which this right should have been made effective. What must be disputed however is the right of Russia to call a halt in the attempt to punish Servia, and to make Servia's cause her own. In this claim of Russia's to act as the protector of Servia — a claim which could not rightly be based, either on the fact that she was a border state, or on economic or dynastic connections, or even on sameness of language —, lay a demand which challenged the resistance of Austria-Hungary and likewise of Germany.

When we find the words of the German White Book cited by the English scholars in the following way:

“We were, in this connection, well-aware that hostile proceedings, if taken by Austria-Hungary against Servia, might bring Russia upon the scene, and thereby involve us in a war. We could not\*) however advise our ally to yield where it would be incompatible with her dignity to do so“,

---

\*) The word „not“ is wanting, although the sense demands it.



we are astonished that men, who in their investigations are accustomed to aim in other cases at the greatest accuracy, have thought proper to omit from the second sentence of the above the justification there stated: "in recognition of the fact that the vital interests of Austria-Hungary were at stake". For it was just the necessity of protecting the vital interests of Austria-Hungary, and accordingly our own, which assigned us our place by the side of our ally. And when the English scholars draw from the same sentence the conclusion, that the German government with those words conceded, ("eingeräumt") that it did not secretly advise Austria to diminish its demands even in the least, they charge that government with having, either voluntarily or involuntarily, let out a secret, which it was incumbent upon it, as an alleged state-secret, to have preserved. The reasons which have led the English scholars to attribute so childlike a simplicity to earnest men, such as they themselves must admit the leaders of German politics to be, lie assuredly very deep; they remain hidden from us.

Since the English scholars call in doubt, on the other hand, the respect of the German government for the truth "in its assurances to the other powers", it would be without purpose to refer to the despatches of the German Emperor, inspired as they are with the warmest love of peace; but the testimony of the Belgian chargé d'affaires in St. Petersburg, M. de l'Escaille, must be proof even against their mistrust. He writes on July 30th to his minister, as follows:

"The one thing incontestable is, that Germany has striven both here and in Vienna to find some means of avoiding a general conflict."

When they insist however that Germany should have taken part in a conference of the representatives of France, England and Italy, as proposed by Sir Edward Grey, they appear to have left out of consideration the fact, that Germany's joining in an attempt to cite Austria before a European tribunal would have had the result, almost by a natural necessity, of severing our relations with our ally. Even our most bitter adversaries should not deem us capable of such criminal frivolity.



V.

Up to this point, — and we gladly make them the acknowledgment — our English colleagues have sought to justify their views by statements which can well form legitimate matter for discussion. When however they go on to say:

“One thing we willingly concede: Germany would most probably have preferred not to become, just yet, involved in a war with England. She would rather first have weakened and humiliated Russia, subjected Servia to the power of Austria, rendered France harmless and Belgium dependent, and then, in possession of a vast superiority of power, have had her reckoning with England”,  
and further:

“Germany’s ground of complaint is: England would not agree to this”,  
we can only remark that this language is a regrettable departure from the lines of a scientific mode of thinking and discussing, and we disdain to speak further of an insinuation which is contradicted by the whole course of the politics of the German Empire.

VI.

We have no doubt that large numbers in England cherished the sincere wish to live in peace with Germany, and the efforts they made to bring about a permanent understanding were fully reciprocated by the endeavors of the German educated classes, acting in accord with their government. But the English government had been already, and before the question of our position towards Belgium aroused them to fever heat, too long involved in an understanding with the Franco-Russian coalition, (see Blue Book Nr. 105, appendix 1), for it to be able or willing to observe a true peace-policy. To prove this it is only necessary for us to refer to the attitude which the English government assumed during the critical time immediately preceding the outbreak of the war. It may be permitted in this connection to make a further quotation from the secret report, already mentioned, of the Belgian charge d’affaires, M. de l’Escaille. He writes:

“To-day in St. Petersburg one is fully persuaded, nay, one has even the assurance, that England will stand by



France. This is a matter of great importance, and has contributed not a little to give the war party the upper hand." (White Book No. 28).

And we add to this a reference to No. 89 of the English Blue Book, according to which Sir Edward Grey, already on the 29th of July, made a statement to the German ambassador, Prince Lichnowsky, which cannot be distinguished from a threat of war:

"We knew very well that if the issue did become such that we thought British interests required us to intervene, we must intervene at once, and the decision would have to be very rapid, just as the decisions of the other Powers had to be."

And if anyone should be still in doubt where, according to the opinion of her leading statesman, the interests of England lay, we would refer him to No. 87 of the Blue Book, according to which Sir Edward Grey, immediately after the conversation with Prince Lichnowsky, reported this to the French ambassador, M. Paul Cambon, and the ambassador received the impression that what Sir Edward Grey mean — and this interpretation was acknowledged to be correct by the latter — was this:

that should other issues be raised — i. e. than that of a conflict between Austria and Russia — and Germany and France become involved so that the question became one of the hegemony of Europe, England would then decide what it was necessary for her to do.

M. Cambon, who knew how to construe rightly this guarded language, was naturally in the highest degree satisfied with it. We are of the opinion however that a government which was sincerely endeavoring to preserve international peace, could have proved its love for this in a more effectual and less equivocal manner than by stirring up the contentious disposition of two states, who were still hesitating to enter upon hostilities, by presenting them with the enticing prospect, that they could be sure of its powerful assistance in case of war.





VII.

This prospect would indeed have proved deceptive, if the English scholars are right in their assertion, that up to the very last there existed in England the determined desire to remain neutral, in case this could have been done without injury to the honor of the nation. Germany herself, so they say, made the fulfilling of this wish impossible.

So Germany's action touched the honor of England! In what way? In that she violated the neutrality of Belgium, which England with other countries, including disloyal Germany, had guaranteed, a guarantee which England felt herself obliged to uphold under all circumstances.

These phrases have indeed become very popular, and were reckoned upon to catch those whose powers of discernment were untrained, but that the learned men of England should adopt them, even though the official publications of their own country, as well as those of France, show clearly the insincerity of such statements, is for us a matter of regret.

Sir Edward Grey, as is well-known, inquired in Berlin on July 30th, whether the German government was prepared to respect the neutrality of Belgium so long as no other power violated it. And on the 1st of August, the German ambassador, Prince Lichnowsky, put to Sir Edward Grey the counter-question, whether if Germany pledged herself to respect this neutrality, England on her part would remain neutral.

State Secretary von Jagow in Berlin answered Sir Edward Grey's question by saying: he must first ask the Kaiser and the Chancellor, a procedure that was necessary not only in our system of government. Sir Edward Grey however replied to the counter-question evasively: the government would consider what to do, it must make its action largely dependent on public opinion, and above all, England is not in a position to promise to remain neutral on a promise made by Germany that goes no further than the observance of the neutrality of Belgium. "I did not think that we could give a promise of neutrality on that condition alone." Blue Book No. 123.



Germany thus made an offer to the English government to observe the neutrality of Belgium — the violation of which that government afterward proclaimed before the world as its real reason for going to war — and the English government disdainfully rejected this offer.

### VIII.

Germany however in her efforts to keep at peace with England went much further. Sir Edward Grey felt himself called upon on the 2nd of August to make the following statement to the French ambassador, M. Cambon:

“I am authorised to give the assurance that if the German fleet comes into the channel or through the North Sea to undertake hostile operations against French coasts or shipping, the British fleet will give all the protection in its power“,

which, as he on August 3rd added by way of explanation, would mean:

“That from this moment on England and Germany would be at war with each other.“ (En sorte que dès ce moment l'Angleterre et l'Allemagne seraient en état de guerre. (Yellow Book, No. 143) ).

These declarations, which, in view of the events expected, were almost equivalent to the unconditioned assurances of an ally, make no reference to the question of Belgian neutrality, which is thus shown to have been in truth in no way decisive for the action of the English government. But let us even accept it as a fact, that England's honor was engaged in the matter. What did Germany do, in order once again to show that she took account of this position of England's and to render the maintenance of English neutrality possible? The answer appears from the report of the French ambassador in London, who on August 3rd announced to his government:

“the German ambassador has let it be known that if England remains neutral, Germany will refrain from carrying on a naval war, and will not make use of the Belgian coast as



a base of operations." (L'Ambassadeur d'Allemagne a adressé à la presse un communiqué disant que si l'Angleterre restait neutre, l'Allemagne renoncerait à toute opération navale et ne se servirait pas des côtes belges comme point d'appui), (Yellow Book, No. 144)

and on the next day the Chancellor, von Bethmann Hollweg, himself declared in the German Reichstag, that

so long as England preserves her neutrality, our fleet will not attack the north coast of France, and we are even ready to refrain from hostile operations against French shipping in case France for her part does not interfere with ours.

We draw from these facts the conclusion, that not only was England's honor most carefully considered by Germany, but also, that it was not at stake, and if we give expression to our conviction that the English government made the question of the violation of Belgian neutrality the basis of its grievances against Germany, only to secure the applause of the crowd, and to allege the pretence of a moral sanction for its own longing to go to war, it would be difficult to refute us.

## IX.

Since however the English scholars dwell upon the moral significance of the so-called violation of Belgian neutrality, we deem it worth while to reply to their contention.

The character of the neutrality of Belgium, which an American has appropriately described as a "one-sided neutrality", is sufficiently indicated by a document in which the director in the Belgian foreign office, Count van der Straaten, has recorded, a conversation which took place on April 23rd, 1912, between the English military attaché in Brussels, lieutenant-colonel Bridges, and general Jungbluth, the chief of the Belgian general-staff. In this conversation the lieutenant-colonel said as follows:

Le gouvernement britannique lors des derniers événements aurait débarqué immédiatement chez nous, même si nous n'a-

At the time of the recent events the English government would have at once landed troops in Belgium even if we had



vions pas demandé de secours.

Le général a objecté qu'il faudrait pour cela notre consentement.

L'Attaché militaire a répondu qu'il le savait, **mais que comme nous n'étions pas à même d'empêcher les Allemands de passer chez nous, l'Angleterre aurait débarqué ses troupes en Belgique en tout état de cause.**

desired no help.

The general objected that our consent would be necessary for that.

The military attaché replied he knew that, **but since we should not be able to restrain the Germans from marching through our country, England would have landed troops in Belgium in any case.**

Against the announcement of this manifest act of violence, neither the Belgian chief-of-staff ventured to offer opposition, nor did the Belgian government feel itself called upon to enter into a similar understanding, *mutatis mutandis*, with Germany, which an honorable neutrality policy would have led it to do. The belief of the German government, that Belgium — it makes no difference whether voluntarily or yielding to the pretext of compulsion — would take her place on the side of the western powers, and that the treaty of 1839 guaranteeing neutrality had long since become a farce, and was only kept alive nominally to lead Germany to relax her vigilance, has thus been strikingly confirmed.

#### X.

In our task of refuting the assertions of the English scholars point by point, we have now reached the last of these. When they say that "never within living memory has there been such a unanimity of opinion in reference to a political question as now", we beg leave to refer them to the utterances of the leader of the English labor party, — utterances which are at least as well known to them as to us, — but above all to the stand which was taken at the beginning of the complications immediately preceding the war by the members of the cabinet, Viscount Morley, John Burns and C. P. Trevelyan; and when Ramsay Macdonald wrote:





“during the last eight years, Sir Edward Grey has been a threat to the peace of Europe, and his policy a misfortune for England,”

the academical circles of Germany have nothing to add to this statement.

### Conclusion.

We repeat here the words upon which we laid emphasis at the beginning of our answer: if one had sought after the means of bringing the nations now arrayed against each other to know one another better, there never could have arisen such a disastrous misunderstanding as that, for example, which is to be found in the closing words of the Declaration of the English scholars. The “military system” in Germany — of this they could and ought to have convinced themselves — was not a bugbear for Europe, as even they would like to have it considered, but the shield which the German people opposed to their adversaries for the protection of their country and their homes, and the belief that Germany had “dreams of the increase of power by violence” was a delusion evoked by a disordered fancy, the result of a nightmare, to attacks of which the English organism, over-nourished by the abundance of countries it has incorporated, is often subject.

We Germans have never begrudged our Anglo-Saxon blood relations their world-encircling power. The course of this war so far has taught us for the first time that the mastery of the seas, which England regards as her hereditary right, and for which she contends up to the point of treating contemptuously established axioms of international law, makes doubtful the continuance and the further development of national culture. To fight against this claim is for us a sacred duty, the performance of which will prove a blessing to all people, and especially to those who through their feebleness have been condemned by England to a loss of their rights. We Germans shall not cease, even in the future, to respect and admire English science and learning, full of confidence however we leave history to decide the question whether in this war England or Germany wields its weapons “in the cause of freedom and of peace”.



- EUGEN D'ALBERT, Hofrat und Professor.  
KARL VON AMIRA, Professor der Rechtswissenschaft,  
München.  
CONRAD ANSORGE, Charlottenburg.  
ERWIN BAUR, Professor der Botanik, Berlin.  
Prof. PETER BEHRENS, Architekt, Berlin.  
IMMANUEL BEKKER, Professor der Rechtswissenschaft,  
Heidelberg.  
OTTO BINSWANGER, Professor der Psychiatrie, Jena.  
LEO BLECH, Kgl. General-Musikdirektor, Charlottenburg.  
WALTER BLOEM, Stuttgart.  
WILHELM VON BODE, EXZ., Gen.-Direktor d. Kgl. Museen,  
Berlin.  
OSKAR BLUMENTHAL, Berlin.  
KARL BONHOEFFER, Professor der Psychiatrie, Berlin.  
LUJO BRENTANO, Professor der Volkswirtschaft, München.  
HANS BUNTE, Professor der chem. Technologie, Karlsruhe.  
HUGO CARO, Rechtsanwalt am Kammergericht, Syndikus des  
Kulturbundes, Berlin.  
HERMANN COHEN, Professor der Philosophie, Berlin.  
LOVIS CORINTH, Berlin.  
CARL CORRENS, Professor der Botanik, Berlin.  
VINZENZ CZERNY, EXZ., Professor der Chirurgie, Heidelberg.  
ERNST DAENELL, Professor der Geschichte, Münster i. Wfl.  
ROBERT DAVIDSOHN, Professor der Geschichte, München.  
Prof. FRANZ VON DEFREGGER, München.  
Prof. WILHELM DÖRPFELD, Berlin.  
ERICH VON DRYGALSKI, Professor der Geographie,  
München.  
FRIEDRICH VON DUHN, Professor der Archäologie, Heidel-  
berg.  
RICHARD EHRENBERG, Professor der Staatswissenschaften,  
Rostock.  
PAUL EHRlich, EXZ., Professor der Medizin, Frank-  
furt a. M.  
GEORG ENGEL, Berlin.  
KARL ENGLER, EXZ., Professor der Chemie, Karlsruhe.



- WILHELM ERB, EXZ., Professor der Medizin, Heidelberg.  
OTTO ERNST, Groß-Flottbek.  
GERH. ESSER, Professor der kath. Theologie, Bonn.  
HERBERT EULENBERG, Kaiserswerth.  
CARL ANTON EWALD, Professor der Medizin, Berlin, L. L. D.  
Univ. of Maryland.  
HEINRICH FINKE, Professor der Geschichte, Freiburg (Br.).  
GUSTAV FRENSEN, Blankenese.  
MAX FRIEDLÄNDER, Professor der Musikgeschichte, Berlin.  
AUGUST VON FRORIEP, Professor der Anatomie, Tübingen.  
LUDWIG FULDA, Berlin.  
LUDWIG GANGHOFER, München.  
Prof. EDUARD VON GEBHARDT, Düsseldorf.  
Prof. FRIEDRICH GERNESHEIM, Berlin.  
CARL GRAEBE, Professor der Chemie, Frankfurt a. M.  
Prof. HANS GRAESSEL, Stadtbaurat, München.  
CORNELIUS GURLITT, Professor der Kunstgeschichte,  
Dresden.  
Prof. HUGO FREIHERR VON HABERMANN, München.  
ERNST HAECKEL, EXZ., Professor der Zoologie, Jena.  
MAX HALBE, München.  
BERNHARD HARMS, Professor der Staatswissenschaften,  
Kiel.  
Prof. ROBERT VON HAUG, Stuttgart.  
HERMANN HAUPT, Professor der Geschichte, Gießen.  
CARL HAUPTMANN, Mittel-Schreiberhau.  
GERHART HAUPTMANN, Agnetendorf.  
ARTHUR HEFFTER, Professor der Pharmakologie, Berlin.  
JULIUS HELLMANN, Direktor der Kolonialbank, Schatz-  
meister des Kulturbundes, Berlin.  
VICTOR HENSEN, Professor der Physiologie, Kiel.  
PAUL MILLINGTON HERRMANN, Direktor der Deutschen  
Bank, Mitglied des Finanzausschusses des Kulturbundes,  
Berlin.  
WILHELM HERRMANN, Prof. d. protest. Theologie, Marburg.  
RICHARD HERTWIG, Professor der Zoologie, München.  
KARL HINKELDEYN, EXZ., Oberbaudirektor, Präsident der  
Akademie des Bauwesens, Charlottenburg.



Prof. ENGELBERT HUMPERDINCK, Berlin.

ERNST VON IHNE, EXZ., Hof-Architekt S. M. des Kaisers,  
Berlin.

WILHELM KAHL, Professor der Rechte, Berlin.

LEOPOLD GRAF VON KALCKREUTH, Präsident des Deut-  
schen Künstlerbundes, Eddelsen.

Prof. ARTHUR KAMPF, Direktor der akad. Hochschule für die  
bildenden Künste, Berlin.

Prof. HEINRICH KAYSER, Architekt, Berlin.

ANTON KOCH, Professor der kath. Theologie, Tübingen.

JOSEF KOHLER, Prof. der Rechtswissenschaft, Berlin.

ALBRECHT KOSSEL, Professor der Physiologie, Heidelberg.

Prof. WILHELM KREIS, Direktor der Kunstgewerbeschule,  
Düsseldorf.

WILLY KÜKENTHAL, Professor der Zoologie, Breslau.

Prof. CARL LANGHAMMER, Berlin.

OTTO LENTZ, Professor der Bakteriologie, Berlin.

MAX LENZ, Professor der Geschichte, Hamburg.

RUDOLF LEONHARD, Professor der Rechtswissenschaft,  
Breslau.

Prof. MAX LIEBERMANN, Berlin.

KARL VON LILIENTHAL, Professor der Rechtswissenschaft,  
Heidelberg.

CARL VON LINDE, Professor der Physik, München.

FRANZ VON LISZT, Professor der Rechtswissenschaft, Berlin.

Prof. FRITZ MACKENSEN, Direktor der Großh. Hochschule für  
bildende Kunst, Weimar.

THOMAS MANN, München.

LUDWIG MANZEL, Präsident der Kgl. Akademie der Künste,  
Berlin.

FELIX MARCHAND, Professor der Medizin, Leipzig.

FRITZ MAUTHNER, Meersburg.

GEORG VON MAYR, Professor der Staatswissenschaften,  
München.

FRIEDRICH MERKEL, Professor der Anatomie, Göttingen.

SEBASTIAN MERKLE, Professor der kath. Theologie, Würz-  
burg.

ERNST VON MEYER, Professor der Chemie, Dresden.





Prof. PAUL MEYERHEIM, Berlin.

ADOLPH MIETHE, Professor der Chemie, Berlin.

LUDWIG MITTEIS, Professor der Rechtswissenschaft, Leipzig.

HEINRICH MÜLLER-BRESLAU, Professor der Ingenieur-  
wissenschaft, Berlin.

HERMANN MUTHESIUS, Architekt, Berlin.

FRIEDRICH NAUMANN, Berlin.

ALBERT NEISSER, Professor der Medizin, Breslau.

CARL VON NOORDEN, Professor der Medizin, Frankfurt  
a. M.

KONRAD OEBBEKE, Professor der Mineralogie und Geologie,  
München.

Prof SIEGFRIED OCHS, Berlin.

Prof. HANS OLDE, Direktor der Kgl. Akademie für bildende  
Künste, Kassel.

HERMANN ONCKEN, Professor der Geschichte, Heidelberg.

FRANZ OPPENHEIMER, Dozent der Staatswissenschaften,  
Berlin.

Prof. BRUNO PAUL, Direktor der Kunstgewerbeschule, Berlin.

MAX PLANCK, Professor der Physik, Berlin.

RUDOLPH PRESBER, Berlin.

KARL RATHGEN, Professor der National-Oekonomie, Ham-  
burg.

Prof. MAX REGER, Generalmusikdirektor, Jena.

HANS RICHTER, Hofkapellmeister a. D., Bayreuth.

ALOIS RIEHL, Professor der Philosophie, Berlin.

FRIEDRICH ROMBERG, Professor der Ingenieurwissen-  
schaften, Berlin.

WILHELM ROUX, Professor der Anatomie, Halle a. S.

MAX RUBNER, Professor der Medizin, Berlin.

EDUARD SACHAU, Professor der orientalischen Philologie,  
Berlin.

Prof. FRITZ SCHAPER, Berlin.

Prof XAVER SCHARWENKA, Berlin.

THEODOR SCHIEMANN, Professor der Geschichte, Berlin.

Prof. CARL LUDWIG SCHLEICH, Berlin.

WILHELM SCHMIDTBONN, München.

Prof. BRUNO SCHMITZ, Charlottenburg.



- GUSTAV VON SCHMOLLER, EXZ., Professor der Volkswirtschaft, Berlin.  
Prof. GUSTAV SCHÖNLEBER, Karlsruhe.  
GUSTAV SCHWALBE, Professor der Anatomie, Straßburg i. E.  
RUDOLF SOHM, Professor der Rechtswissenschaften, Leipzig.  
DR. KARL STRUPP, Frankfurt a. M.  
JOSEF STÜBBEN, Geheimer Oberbaurat, Berlin.  
Prof. FRANZ VON STUCK, München.  
HERMANN SUDERMANN, Berlin.  
Prof. HENRY THODE.  
Prof. HANS THOMA, EXZ., Karlsruhe.  
Prof. WILHELM TRÜBNER, Karlsruhe.  
Prof. LOUIS TUAILLON, Berlin.  
PAUL UNNA, Professor der Medizin, Hamburg.  
MAX VERWORN, Professor der Physiologie, Bonn.  
HANS VIRCHOW, Professor der Anatomie, Berlin.  
KARL VOLLMÖLLER, Berlin.  
RICHARD VOSS, Königssee.  
ADOLF WACH, EXZ., Professor der Rechtswissenschaft, Leipzig.  
ADOLF WAGNER, EXZ., Professor der Staatswissenschaft, Berlin.  
SIEGFRIED WAGNER, Bayreuth.  
WILHELM WALDEYER, Professor der Anatomie, Berlin.  
THEODOR WIEGAND, Direktor an den Kgl. Museen zu Berlin.  
W. WIEN, Professor der Physik, Würzburg.  
RICHARD WILLSTÄTTER, Professor der Chemie, Berlin.  
HEINRICH WÖLFFLIN, Professor der Kunstgeschichte, München.  
ERNST FREIHERR VON WOLZOGEN, Darmstadt.  
LUDWIG WÜLLNER, Berlin.  
WILHELM WUNDT, Professor der Philosophie, Leipzig.  
HERMANN ZIMMERMANN, Professor der Ingenieurwissenschaften, Berlin.  
FEDOR VON ZOBELTITZ, Berlin.  
PHILIPP ZORN, Professor des Staats- und Völkerrechts, Bonn.  
N. ZUNTZ, Professor der Physiologie, Berlin.



## APPENDIX.

### A DECLARATION BY THE PROFESSORS OF GREAT BRITAIN ADDRESSED TO THE ACADEMICAL CIRCLES OF GERMANY. (\*)

---

---

We see with regret the names of many German professors and men of science, whom we regard with respect, and in many cases with feelings of personal friendship, signed to an accusation against England, an accusation so utterly groundless that we can scarcely regard it as their independent and well-considered judgment. We are far from doubting their personal sincerity when they express their horror of war and their zeal for the advancement of culture. We are obliged however to refer to the fact, that a quite different conception of war and of a policy of national expansion based on the threats of war, is represented by such influential writers as Nietzsche, von Treitschke, von Bilow and von Bernhardi, and finds general acceptance in the press and public opinion of Germany. Among no other civilized people is this the case, and according to our opinion, could scarcely be so. We must also call attention to the circumstance, that until now only German armies have with conscious intent bombarded and destroyed such monuments of culture and learning as the library at Louvain and the Cathedrals of Reims and Malines.

It is without doubt difficult for the individual man under his human limitations, to weigh justly the points in dispute affecting his own country; it is perhaps especially difficult for the German to do this, brought up as he is in an atmosphere of admiration for the Kaiser and his army, feeling heavily the pressure of the present time, and living under a government, which, as we believe, withholds from him the truth. It is a duty however laid upon scholars to test accurately the facts on which they rely. Germany's White Book contains only a scanty and cautiously chosen selection from the diplomatic correspondence which preceded the war. We hope our German colleagues will do their best to obtain access sooner or later to the complete correspondence, and from that, form for themselves an independent judgment.

If they do this, they will see that from the time of the delivery of the Austrian note to Serbia, England, whom they make responsible for the

---

\*) The following translation has been made from the German text of the "Declaration", which was the one sent to us by its framers and signers. The English original, if any, has not been accessible to us.



war, had worked unremittingly for the preservation of peace. England's proposals found acceptance in France, Russia and Italy, but alas, not on the part of Germany, the only power whose word of protest spoken in Vienna would have ensured peace. Though the series of documents produced by Germany in her defence is incomplete, yet even in those published she does not seek to create the impression that she had labored in the interests of peace; she sought "to localise the conflict"; she took the position, that Austria had the right to demand a free hand in imposing upon Servia "a just punishment", in any form she pleased. At the most, Germany proposed that no Servian territory should be annexed, a senseless proposal, since the fulfilling of Austria's demands would have robbed Servia in any case of her freedom.

England, as well as the rest of Europe, recognized that whatever ground of complaint Austria may have had, the unconscionable conditions imposed on Servia constituted a challenge to Russia and a provocation to war. The Emperor Francis Joseph in his proclamation already gave it to be understood that it would probably come to war. The German White Book contains the following words: "We were in this connection very well aware that hostile proceedings, if taken by Austria-Hungary against Servia, might bring Russia upon the scene, and thereby involve us in a war. We could not however advise our ally to yield, where it would be incompatible with her dignity to do so." The German government admits by this that it was acquainted beforehand with the contents of the Austrian note, while it was kept secret from all the other powers; it admits that after the delivery of the note it supported the demands made in it, and concedes further that it was aware of the probability that by so doing it hastened on the war, and that — whatever its assurances to the other powers may have been — it did not secretly advise Austria to abate its demands even in the smallest degree. According to our view, Germany has thus admitted that in conjunction with her unfortunate ally, she has knowingly provoked the present war.

One thing we willingly concede: Germany would most probably have preferred not to have become just yet involved in a war with England. She would rather first have weakened and humiliated Russia, subjected Servia to the power of Austria, rendered France harmless and Belgium dependent, and then possessed of greatly superior power, have had her reckoning with England. Germany's ground of complaint is: England would not agree to this.

The love of peace was so deeply rooted in England, and those who had, during many difficult years, labored to create better relations between England and Germany, occupied such an influential position, that in spite of the bands of friendship which united us with France, and in spite of the threatening danger, it was the decided wish up to the very last, to preserve the neutrality of England in case it could be done without detriment to our national honor. But Germany herself made the fulfilment of this wish impossible.

England had in common with France, Russia, Prussia and Austria undertaken the solemn obligation of guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium. The preservation of this neutrality was for us a matter of deepest sentiment and likewise of most vital interest. The violation of this neutrality would not





only destroy the independence of Belgium, but also the whole foundation on which rest the possibility of neutrality at all and the existence of such states as are weaker than their neighbors. Our mode of action in 1914 was the same as in 1870. At that time both powers gave us the assurance they would observe the neutrality agreement, and both kept their word. In the present case, France gave the desired assurance at once, on the 31st of July; Germany, on the contrary, delayed her answer. And when Germany after this threatening silence, started in before our eyes to break the treaty which had been signed in common, apparently in the expectation that we would play the part of an intimidated assessor, the doubt of even the most peace loving of our people was resolved. Belgium implored England to keep her word, and England did keep it.

The German professors seem to be of the belief that Germany can in such a case count upon many sympathizers among academical circles in England. In this they find themselves in a grievous error; never within living memory has there been such unanimity of opinion in reference to a political question as at present. We have a sincere and deep admiration for German science and research. Many ties connect us with Germany; ties of work in common, of esteem, of personal friendship. At the same time we feel it deeply that Germany, to whom we had looked up, has shown herself, under the pernicious influence of a military system and of dreams of increase of power through violence, the common enemy of Europe and of all lands which respect the law of nations. The war we are now waging must be carried on to the end; for us as for Belgium, it is a defensive war, a war for freedom and peace.

CLIFFORD ALLBUTT, Regius Professor of Physic, Cambridge. T. W. ALLEN, Reader in Greek, Oxford. E. AEMSTRONG, Pro-Provost of Queen's College, Oxford. E. V. ARNOLD, Professor of Latin, University College of North Wales. C. B. BALL, Regius Professor of Surgery at the University of Dublin. THOMAS BARLOW, President of the Royal College of Physicians, London. BERNHARD BOSANQUET, formerly Professor of Moral Philosophy, University of St. Andrews. A. C. BRADLEY, formerly Professor of Poetry, Oxford. W. H. BRAGG, Cavendish Professor of Physics, University of Leeds. THOMAS BROCK, Oxford, Membre d'Honneur de la Société des Artistes français. A. J. BROWN, Professor of Biology and Chemistry of Fermentation, University of Birmingham. JOHN BURNETT, Professor of Greek, University of St. Andrews. J. B. BURY, Regius Professor of Modern History, Cambridge. WILLIAM WATSON CHEYNE, Professor of Clinical Surgery, King's College, London, President of the Royal College of Surgeons. A. C. CLARK, Professor of Latin, Oxford. J. NORMAN COLLIE, Professor of Organic Chemistry and Director of the Chemical Laboratories, University College, Gower Street, London. F. C. CONYBEARE, Honorary Fellow of University College, Oxford. HENRY CRAIK, Member of Parliament for Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities. JAMES CRICHTON-BROWNE, Vice-President and Treasurer, Royal Institution. WILLIAM CROOKES, President of the Royal Society. FOSTER CUNLIFFE, Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. FRANCIS DARWIN, late Reader in Botany, Cambridge. A. V. DICEY, Fellow of All Souls College and formerly Vinerian Professor of English Law, Oxford. S. DILL, Hon. Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.



JAMES DONALDSON, Vice-Chancellor and Principal of the University of St. Andrews. F. W. DYSON, Astronomer Royal. EDWARD ELGAR, ARTHUR EVANS, Extraordinary, Professor of Prehistoric Archaeology, Oxford. L. R. FARNELL, Rector of Exeter College, Oxford. C. H. FIRTH, Regius Professor of Modern History, Oxford. HERBERT A. L. FISCHER, Vice-Chancellor of Sheffield University. J. A. FLEMING, Professor of Electrical Engineering in the University of London. H. S. FOXWELL, Professor of Political Economy in the University of London. EDWARD FRY, Ambassador Extraordinary and First British Plenipotentiary to the Hague Peace Conference in 1907. PERCY GARDNER, Professor of Classical Archaeology, Oxford. ARCHIBALD GEIKIE, Past President of the Royal Society. W. M. GELDART, Fellow of All Souls College, and Vinerian Professor of English Law, Oxford. RICKMAN GODLEE, Emeritus Professor of Clinical Surgery, University College, London. B. P. GRENFELL, late Professor of Papyrology, Oxford. E. H. GRIFFITHS, Principal of the University College of South Wales and Monmouthshire. W. H. HADOW, Principal of Armstrong College, Newcastle. J. S. HALDANE, late Reader in Physiology, Oxford. MARCUS HARTOG, Professor of Zoology in University College, Cork. F. J. HAVERFIELD, Camden, Professor of Ancient History, Oxford. W. A. HERDMAN, Professor of Zoology in the University of Liverpool, General Secretary of the British Association. W. P. HERRINGHAM, Vice-Chancellor of the University of London. E. W. HOBSON, Sadleirian Professor of Pure Mathematics, Cambridge. D. G. HOGARTH, Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. ALFRED HOPKINSON, late Vice-Chancellor of Manchester University. A. S. HUNT, Professor of Papyrology, Oxford. HENRY JACKSON, Regius Professor of Greek, Cambridge. THOMAS G. JACKSON. F. B. JEVONS, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Durham. H. H. JOACHIM, Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. J. JOLY, Professor of Geology and Mineralogy, University of Dublin. COURTNEY KENNY, Downing Professor of the Laws of England, Cambridge, British Museum. HORACE LAMB, Professor of Mathematics, Manchester University. J. N. LANGLEY, Professor of Physiology, Cambridge. WALTER LEAF, Fellow of London University, President of the Hellenic Society. SIDNEY LEE, Editor of the Dictionary of National Biography, Professor of the English Language and Literature in the University of London. OLIVER LODGE, Principal of the University of Birmingham, formerly Professor of Physics, University College, Liverpool. DONALD MACALISTER, Principal and Vice-Chancellor, University of Glasgow, President of the General Medical Council of the United Kingdom. REGINALD W. MACAN, Master of University College, Oxford. WILLIAM MACEWEN, Professor of Surgery, Glasgow. J. W. MACKAIL, Professor of Poetry, Oxford. PATRICK MANSON. R. R. MARETT, Reader in Social Anthropology, Oxford, President of the Folk-Lore Society. D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, Laudian Professor of Arabic, Oxford. HENRY A. MIERS, Principal of the University of London. FREDERICK W. MOTT, Fullerian Professor of Physiology, Royal Institution. MOULTON, Baron, Lord of Appeal in Ordinary. JAMES E. H. MURPHY, Professor of Irish, Dublin University. GILBERT MURRAY, Regius Professor of Greek, Oxford. JOHN L. MYRES, Wykeham Professor of Ancient History, Oxford. GEORGE H. F. NUTTALL, Quick Professor of Biology, Cambridge. WILLIAM OSLER, Regius Professor of Medicine, Oxford. ISAMBARD



Owen, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Bristol. WALTER PARRATT, Master of the King's Music, Professor of Music, Oxford. HUBERT PARRY, Director of Royal College of Music. W. H. PERKIN, Waynflete Professor of Chemistry, Oxford. W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE, Edwards Professor of Egyptology, University College, London. A. F. POLLARD, Professor of English History, University of London. FREDERICK POLLOCK, formerly Corpus Professor of Jurisprudence, Oxford. EDWARD B. POULTON, President of the Linnaea Society of London, Hope Professor of Zoology, Oxford. EDWARD J. POYNTER, President of the Royal Academy of Arts, London. ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH, King Edward VII. Professor of English Literature, Cambridge. WALTER RALEIGH, Professor of English Literature, Oxford. WILLIAM RAMSAY, Emeritus Professor of Chemistry, University of London. RAYLEIGH, Baron, Past President Royal Society, Nobel Laureate; Chancellor, Cambridge University; formerly Professor of Experimental Physics, Cambridge, and of Natural Philosophy, Royal Institution. REAY, Baron, First President British Academy. JAMES REID, Professor of Ancient History, Cambridge. JOHN RHYE, Professor of Celtic, Oxford. WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, Disney Professor of Archaeology, Cambridge. T. F. ROBERTS, Principal of the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Wales. HENRY E. ROSCOE, Emeritus Professor of Chemistry, Owens College, Manchester. J. HOLLAND ROSE, Reader in Modern History, Cambridge. RONALD ROSS, formerly Professor of Tropical Medicine, University of Liverpool; Nobel Laureate. W. E. SADLER, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Leeds, late Professor of the History and Administration of Education in the University of Manchester. W. SANDAY, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Oxford. J. E. SANDYS, Public Orator in the University of Cambridge. ERNEST SATOW, Second British Delegate to the Hague Peace Conference in 1907. A. H. SAYCE, Professor of Assyriology, Oxford. ARTHUR SCHUSTER, late Professor of Physics at the University of Manchester. D. H. SCOTT, formerly Professor of Botany, University College, London, Foreign Secretary of the Royal Society. C. S. SHERRINGTON, Waynflete Professor of Physiology, Oxford. GEORGE ADAM SMITH, Principal Advice-Chancellor of the University of Aberdeen. G. S. MOORE SMITH, Professor of English Language and Literature in the University of Sheffield. E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN, Professor of Music, Cambridge. V. H. STANTON, Ely Professor Divinity, Cambridge. J. ARTHUR THOMSON, Regius Professor of Natural History, Aberdeen University. JOSEPH J. THOMSON, Professor of Experimental Physics, Cambridge; Professor of Physics, Royal Institution, London. T. F. TOUT, Professor of Mediaeval and Modern History, University of Manchester. WILLIAM TURNER, Principal and Vice-Chancellor of Edinburgh University. CHARLES WALDENSTEIN, late Reader in Classical Archaeology and Slade Professor of Fine Art, Cambridge; Vice-President, Hellenic Society. JOHN WOLFE-BARRY. ALMROTH WRIGHT, formerly Professor of Pathology, Army Medical School, Netley. C. T. HAGBERG WRIGHT, Librarian, London Library. JOSEPH WRIGHT, Professor of Comparative Philology, Oxford.

---



# „Kulturbund“

League of German Scholars and Artists.

---

---

Already published:

**The German Government in relation to Works of Art  
in Belgium** by Dr. W. von Bode

Editions in German, English, French, Italian and Spanish.

**The Success of the German War Loan**  
by Geheimrat Prof. Dr. Riesser

Editions in German, English, French, Italian and Spanish

**Correspondence between Yves Guyot and Daniel  
Bellet and Lujo Brentano**

in German and French

**The Iron Industry and the war**  
by E. Schrödter, Doctor h. c. of Engineering

in German

---

---

